

1

*COLLATERAL
TESTIMONIES
TO
"QUAKER"
PRINCIPLES.*

M. E. BECK.

BX
7732
.B388
1889



BX 7732 .B388 1889
Beck, Mary Elizabeth
Collateral testimonies to
"Quaker" principles

R. H. Rose
with the kind regards
of the writer
6. 88 -



COLLATERAL

TESTIMONIES

TO

“QUAKER”

PRINCIPLES.

BY
✓
M. E. BECK.

Second Edition. Revised and Enlarged.

SAMUEL HARRIS & Co.,
5, BISHOPSGATE WITHOUT, E.C.

INDEX.

CHAPTER I.—1. Introductory Remarks—2. Why the Society of Friends were needed— 3. From what Root sprang their Views on Worship	7
CHAPTER II.—Gospel Ministry	28
CHAPTER III.—Christ's Reward	45
CHAPTER IV.—What the Society of Friends believe Respecting the Ordinances	52
CHAPTER V.—War	71
CHAPTER VI.—Oaths	78
CHAPTER VII.—The Ground of Protest against Con- formity to the World	80

PREFACE.

This little volume has had its origin in lectures prepared by the Writer for vocal delivery, having for their aim the elucidation of the principles held by the Society of Friends.

Whilst turning her attention to the subject, she has rejoiced to find how nearly in accord with one or other of those Principles, supposed to be peculiar to that Society, were the thoughts of spiritually-minded Christians of widely differing religious denominations, having little, as to outward manifestation, that could be said to be "*en rapport*" with the simple practices of Friends. That the spirit underlies the letter, and that the life is more than raiment, seems to be the obvious deduction.

Break away the shell of external observances and the essential element remaining is Christianity, pure and simple, for which Fox pleaded; and we could almost build up an ideal church after his model by simply gathering together the scattered thoughts of men of deep spiritual intuition, in various ages, who, unknown to themselves, had a grasp of the same truths which constituted the very genius of so-called Quakerism.

In these witnesses to the innermost kernel of Christianity, under whatever name, we recognise our fellow-believers and the true unity of the Church of Christ.

CHAPTER I.

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.
2. WHY THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS WERE NEEDED.
3. FROM WHAT ROOT SPRANG THEIR VIEWS ON WORSHIP.

Collateral testimonies from G. R. Jacob, Chalmers, Bonar, Vaughan, &c.

“I am not come to destroy but to fulfil.”—Matt. v. 17.

Before entering upon the subjects immediately before us, it may be well, in a few words, to contrast the spirit of the Old and New Dispensation, as we are told in the Epistle to the Hebrews that the first was to be superseded by the last.

The Old Dispensation was expressly adapted to the childhood of the race; it was local, exclusive, typical, and precise. The daily sacrifices, the human priesthood, the stately temple, “exceeding magnificent,” the appointed feasts, were all fitted to teach through the senses.

The people of that earlier day were dealt with as we deal with children—we teach them by pictures and symbols before they are able to grasp abstract truths. In the same way the legislation was precise;

their whole conduct was governed by minute and special rules. "Thou shalt" and "thou shalt not" characterise the books of Leviticus and Numbers with an individuality of detail which would seem to us wearisome, just as the Mahomedans, who have never outgrown their childhood, are still kept in tutelage under 75,000 precepts (so it is said) of the Mussulman code. Yet all through the Psalms and the Prophets, hints of better things in store appear, when God should have educated His people for higher perceptions. "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it." "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit." "Will I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats?" "Offer unto God thanksgiving, and pay thy vows unto the Most High." Again, in what glowing language does the prophet Micah point out that no external offerings, however costly, can constitute the essence of true worship. "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with tens of thousands of rivers of oil?.....He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good. And what doth the Lord thy God require of thee but to do justly, and love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

At last, after long centuries of preparation, appeared, during the manhood of the race, the promised Messiah, the Antitype of the figures of the Mosaic ritual. By fulfilling the law He ended it, and introduced His own spiritual kingdom. This kingdom in its whole organization formed a strong contrast to the

old law. Principles took the place of precept ; even the sayings of our Lord Himself were, for the most part, suggestive rather than literal, and contained in themselves the power of expansiveness, leaving room for growth in their mode of application. There was nothing cramped or fettering in them — no rigid adhesion to the letter, which would circumscribe the outburst of the life within. No form of worship was prescribed by Him. The emphatic words, “ God is a Spirit, and they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth,” were left to be interpreted according to the spiritual capacity of the worshipper. Doubtless the worship of the early Christians was founded on the mode of the Jewish synagogue, where a liberty of action appears to have been accorded not generally recognised now.* The very fact of the establishment of the synagogue worship during the period of the Babylonish captivity was it itself a tacit acknowledgment of the power of expansion admitted, under changed circumstances, even under the rigid formula of the Old Dispensation. “ The Apostles,” says G. A. Jacob, D.D., in his *Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament*, “ took nothing from the temple system for the machinery of their church government ; they had been divinely taught that those priests and services were typical forms and shadows, which were all centred and fulfilled and done away in Christ, and

* See Luke iv. 16, and Acts xiii. 15.

to reinstate them in the Christian church, would have been, in their judgment, to go back to the bondage of weak and beggarly elements from the liberty, strength, and rich completeness of the gospel dispensation."

The first band of disciples seem to have met together, sometimes in one house, sometimes in another, as a company of brothers and sisters who owned Christ as their common Master. As far as we can judge, no strict formula of worship was laid down, but every one whose heart was filled with the constraining love of Christ, was encouraged to use his gift for the edification of the body; yet still in right order, one by one, the spirits of the prophets being subject to the prophets, "For God," said the Apostle Paul, "is not the God of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints."

We quote again from G. A. Jacob:—"The remarks which St. Paul makes about the public worship of the Corinthian Christians, where every one 'had a psalm, had a doctrine, had a tongue, had a revelation,' and did not even observe due order and propriety in uttering them.....are quite incompatible with the use of devotional formularies laid down beforehand and known to all the worshippers. And when it is further noticed that St. Paul, though desiring to correct disorders, does not at all condemn or disapprove of this mode of worship, provided that all things were done decently and in order, and that he neither here nor elsewhere—nor any other of the

Apostles, as far as we are informed—recommended any forms of prayer to be used, it is scarcely possible that there should be any reasonable doubt as to what the practice was at that period.” (Ecclesiastical Polity, p. 219).

At the end of the second century, or beginning of the third, appear the first indications of *buildings* specially appropriated to divine service, but these seem to have been of a simple and unpretending nature. No holiness was attached to the place in which they worshipped; the word which we translate church, is used in the New Testament 115 times, and signifies an assembly of persons, not a place. The “sanctity was in the worshippers who met together in the Saviour’s name, and the reverence was given to His spiritual presence, which had been promised to those who should be thus assembled.” (Ecclesiastical Polity). But the simplicity which prevailed during the times of persecution in the early Christian Church, banding its fraternity together in one common sympathy, quickly gave way to much that was of man’s appointment as soon as Christianity became, in 328, under Constantine, the religion of the State. A kind of compromise appears to have been made between the old heathen practices and those of the new religion, and observances which remind us of the Jewish ritual and Levitical priesthood took the place of the simplicity which characterised the Gospel of Christ. Churches of costly magnificence were built for the worship of

Him "who dwelleth not in temples made with hands."*

"For us who can look back upon the history of the past," says G. A. Jacob, before quoted, "to choose for our imitation the florid display of the *later* time rather than the simplicity of the *first*, is surely a grave mistake, and one which ought not to be found in a church in which the New Testament has been for more than 300 years in the hands of the people, and its supreme authorship openly avowed The use of æsthetic stimulants to devotion, appealing to the sentiments and imagination by means of architectural ornamentation, pictures, crosses, images, etc., which now, as in more ancient times, beguile the ignorant and unwary—will be seen to be not only no aids to Christian doctrine and devotion, but positive hindrances to them, since in proportion as such things answer the purpose for which they are intended, and engage the attention and affect the feelings, to the same extent do they shut out Gospel truth and hide Christ from the spirit of the worshipper."

Co-eval with the adornment of churches came in the use of gold and silver vessels, wax tapers, incense, and the adoption of official vestments for ministers. "All these were derived from Jewish or heathen practices, as the Church, having lost the freshness

* "That churches should turn to painted windows, scientific music and the like, as their attractions, shows disease inside and out."—*Geikie's "Life of Christ."*

and fulness of Apostolic truth, learned from such objectionable sources to affect a more elaborate ceremonial and to court an exhibition of æsthetic display, quite foreign to the devout simplicity of the Apostolic age." (Ecclesiastical Polity.)

Ministers of religion began at this time to be supported from the public treasuries; in 416 infant baptism was made imperative in North Africa, singers were established as an order, under protest, (Neander tells us) in the IVth Century, and the Creed sung in 590. The introduction of organs into public worship did not take place till the XIIth Century. It may here be remarked, by way of parenthesis, though somewhat antedating the course of events, that eminent Christians of various denominations have felt the danger attending that which appeals chiefly to the senses in worship. Herschell, a convert from Judaism, remarks, "I firmly believe that if we seek to affect the mind by the aid of architecture, painting, or music, the impression produced by these adjuncts is just so much abstracted from the worship of the unseen Jehovah. The ear that is entranced with the melody of sweet sound, listens not to the still small voice by which the Lord makes His presence known." "You easily understand," says Dr. Chalmers, "how a taste for music is one thing, and a real submission to the influence of religion is another, how the ear may be regaled by the melody of sound, and the heart may utterly refuse the proper impression of the

sense that is conveyed to it." Cotton Mather says, "There is not one word of institution in the New Testament for instrumental music in the worship of God." At a Convention of a United Presbyterian Church, held in Pennsylvania, Oct., 1883, for the express purpose of protesting against the admission of musical instruments into public worship, George C. Vincent, D.D., President of Franklin College, read a paper in which he says, "We charge that the use of instruments is at the expense of spirituality. Musical instruments came in with images, incense, and other corruptions of the Romish church." "The introduction of instrumental music," wrote W. W. Barr in a paper called "History of the Introduction of Music into the Reformed Churches," "has been uniformly preceded or accompanied by a decline of spirituality in the worship."

Wesley writes in one of his hymns,

"Still let us on our guard be found,
And watch against the power of *sound*
With sacred jealousy,
Lest haply sense should damp our zeal,
And music's charms bewitch and steal
Our hearts away from Thee."

"Nothing must be allowed," says Horatius Bonar, D.D., "to come between the sheep and the Shepherd, or blunt the influence of His voice. Even when the things are lawful and harmless in themselves the question requires always to be considered, 'How do they affect our hearing of the Shepherd's voice?'.....

The crowded meeting, the eloquent speech, the fervent appeal, the hearty music are very enjoyable, but they are not without their perils. The Shepherd's voice may perchance be lost in the excitement of human feeling. To go 'out of hearing' of that voice is fatal to our following Him; but even when we keep within hearing we must be on our guard lest, in the confusion and mixture of other sounds, the one dear voice should lose all its power and sweetness; for there is *but one voice* that the flock needs to hear, and to hear continually. Whatever then dulls that voice, or divides its influence, is injury with which we dare not trifle.....There was a congregation in which music was cultivated to the utmost. The ear was gratified every Sunday with singing of the most perfect kind. Worldly men dropped in to hear the musical 'treat' prepared in the name of worship and went away in raptures. But as these dropped in, the godly dropped out. They could no longer hear the Shepherd's voice. It was drowned in human melody.....Culture, poetry, literature, song, sensation will not supply the lack of the Holy Spirit, or make up for the want of the Shepherd's voice."

What Dr. Bonar says respecting music in the churches may fittingly introduce the objection felt by Friends to the ordinary mode of singing hymns as part of a pre-arranged service, in which it is to be feared many join with the lips whose experience is a contradiction to the words they sing. Defining

worship to be the "adoring response of the heart and mind to the influence of the Spirit of God,"* they believe, in the words of Barclay, that "the singing that pleases Him" must proceed "from a true sense of God's love in the heart, and arise from the Divine influence of the Spirit, which leads souls to breathe forth either a sweet harmony, or words suitable to the present condition."

The dark apostacy of the Papacy and all the evils, to which it gave rise, consisted in imposing a human authority between the soul and God. The grand power of the Reformation inaugurated by Luther and his predecessors, so far as it went, lay in the re-instating Christ as the only Mediator between God and man, and as the ever-living Head over His own Church. "Religion, as Luther conceived it," writes Froude, "did not consist in certain things done to and for a man by a so-called process. It was the devotion of each individual soul to the service of God." Had these principles been carried out to their legitimate extent in worship, in Church government, in the individual responsibility of each soul to its God alone, there would seem to have been no need for the rise of Quakerism. But we know how the wave of progress was arrested in its course, and even swept back as by a receding tide. The aim of Fox was solely to remove the superincumbent strata which had

* New York Y. M. Epistle, 1877.

accumulated since the Apostolic age, and to restore "broad, unfettered, primitive Christianity," or, to use his own well-known words, "to bring people to Christ, and to leave them there." His purpose was to vitalize professing Christendom, and we see that after the lapse of centuries it is gradually becoming realised, for some of those special truths which the Society of Friends, were at first not only ridiculed, but even severely persecuted for holding, have now come to the front and are making their way in the religious world of all denominations, thus tending to confirm the remark of a well-know modern writer, that "Quakerism is the absolute religion behind all others or rather that which is absolute and eternal in all others." Accepting as their primary axiom, "We are nothing, Christ is all;" coming together with the deep realization of His assurance that He was in their midst, how was it possible for those who thus believed in His real presence to worship Him in any other way than that of reverent silence till He should manifest His will? It is the place of a scholar thus to reverence his Teacher, waiting for His commands, not in listless inactivity, but with the outstretched desire to know his duty that he may do it. "As the eyes of servants look unto the hands of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hands of her mistress, so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God."

At the opening meeting of the Northfield Conference, D. L. Moody said that many friends had asked

him what the programme of the Conference was to be. In reply he had to say that he had made out several programmes, and had torn them all up. He had no programme. He was "waiting on God to lead them, waiting on God to speak." During one of these large gatherings, about twenty minutes was spent at his request in silent prayer, and this time of united silent devotion was described as "blessed and powerful."

Another eminent preacher says, "It would be well if in our brief time of worship we could set aside a few moments for absolute silence, no minister to speak, no organ to utter its voice, no hymn to trouble the air... the fool would misunderstand and think nothing was being done, but as the last expression of velocity is rest, so the last expression of eloquence is silence, and sometimes the highest liturgy is to be dumb. We have banished the angel of silence.....we have set noise in the front, and silence has been exiled from the church."

At the last meeting of the recent Christian Conference at Washington, W. E. Dodge, who represented the Alliance, asked for a time of silent prayer. "An almost Pentecostal silence followed; the multitude being, as is were, lifted spiritually, on a wave of adoration and prayer, near to the mercy-seat."

Dr. Vaughan, in his "Harrow Sundays," speaks in eloquent words of the value of silence as a fitting preparation for the highest work. "No religious duty can be profitably performed without a preliminary

and prefatory silence..... This is the secret of so many barren and unfruitful ministries, that men are trying to dispense with silence.....Silence is one of God's ordinances, and speech and labour another.....But how can we leave unnoticed the Divine aspect of silence ; the silence of awe, the silence of meditation, the silence of prayer, yes, the silence of praise ?..... And once more, when we pray, who has not felt that oftentimes his best prayer is silence ; that unuttered yearning of which St. Paul speaks as constituting the very intercession of the Spirit, the very thing which rises with acceptance into the ear of the Searcher of hearts ? Nay in all true prayer, even in the prayer of the congregation, the deepest, innermost secret is silence ; even if the lips speak, they do not really pray ; it is the secret, silent heart within which really carries on the worship in each particular worshipper, and without this the sound of the loudest response becomes at once a babbling and a nothingness. Prayer, true prayer, is, so far as its essence is concerned, a silent thing ; and is not praise silent also ? Yes, again the Psalmist goes before us, and says, according to the forcible words of the original, '*Praise is silent for Thee, O God, in Zion ;*' for praise is but another word for adoration ; that prostration of the whole soul before the felt and realised presence of the Most High and Holy God, which is the attitude of the heavenly hosts, and to which, on earth at least, whosoever approximates, must do so in the secret of his own

inner solitude, conscious of no other presence than that of Him Whose he is and Whom he serves."

The passage in the 65th Psalm, to which reference has just been made, is translated by some, "Thou art praised in silence, O God, in Zion."

"Maimonides tells us that when the priest among the Jews burnt incense in the sanctuary, at the time of offering the daily sacrifice, there reigned a deep silence. At that time every noise must cease, and every man composed himself to prayers, which were poured forth in silence to God."

A few words from a former writer in the *Spectator* may fitly find a place here. "Some Friends, it is said, think that this silence is but an accident of their worship, not fit for these times—to us Barclay's ideas seem higher and holier—'The great work of all ought to be to wait upon God, and, retiring out of their own thoughts and imaginations, to feel the Lord's presence, and know a gathering into His name indeed, where He is in the midst, according to His promise. Silence is, and must necessarily be, a special and principal part of God's worship.' Let the Friends cleave fast to these wise words. Time will not soon make old, and certainly not in these babbling days, the truth that in silent waiting the deepest communings of the soul breathe forth."

Thus, also Whittier, in the "Prayer of Agassiz:—

" By past efforts unavailing,
Doubt and error, loss and failing,
Of our weakness made aware,

On the threshold of our task,
 Let us light and guidance ask,
 Let us pause in silent prayer.

* * * *

As in life's best hours we hear
 By the Spirit's finer ear,
 His low voice within us, thus
 The All-Father heareth us,
 And His holy ear we pain,
 With our noisy words and vain,
 His the primal language. His
 The eternal silences !"

In this solemn exercise of united silent prayer all may join. It is an excellent preparation for both preachers and hearers, enabling the first to give God's message as He gives it to them, and the last to receive it to edification. Although, in a healthy state of the church, the gift of prophecying in its largest Scriptural sense would, we believe, be abundantly poured out on sons and on daughters, yet there have been times when the attitude of the congregation or of the individual has been turned towards Him, when He has been pleased most remarkably to manifest His power without spoken words. As an instance of this we may mention that wonderful meeting at Maine, on the borders of Canada, thus described by Dr. Mahan, D.D. :—"Many thousands of Christians and others were gathered together for a ten days' conference and many of these were earnestly uniting in prayer to be filled with the Spirit. Then commenced a season of *entirely silent prayer, which continued for three hours*. As the time passed on the place became to

the spiritual consciousness, awfully glorious. No words can describe the solemn, overpowering sense of the presence of God. Any expression of prayer or singing seemed an intrusion, and persons who commenced instinctively stopped. God was Himself speaking to them in their inmost hearts. None dared break the solemn silence of soul before Him. They were now learning what the worship of the whole being to its Creator and God is. As they saw the holiness of God, they gained new views of their own sinfulness in themselves, and with this they saw with equal distinctness, the full provision in Christ for all their need.. ...When (after an interval for needful refreshment) the time for the evening service approached, the President lifted up his hands, and said solemnly to the crowd, ‘Bow down before the Lord, your Maker!’ saints and sinners knelt together. Not another word was said or hymn sung, but when we gathered in the immense tent, then we knew what God had done for his people in waiting before Him. The President said that God had given him all he had asked for, and many testified that the words of the prayer for the Ephesians had been answered in their own souls. That evening the conversion of over one hundred persons took place as the result of that wonderful silent meeting before the Lord.”

Let no one suppose that in citing the foregoing extracts the writer of this paper wishes to prove that silence is the only acceptable mode of worship. *Far from it.* They

are rather quoted to show that Christians of other denominations recognise its power in its results. There is nothing in this that militates against the exhortation of the Apostle, "Covet earnestly the best gifts, but rather that ye may prophecy." "He that prophesieth edifieth the Church." Let each be in God's order and the blessing will be sure.

It is not a little remarkable that Robert Barclay, the acute logician, and Stephen Grellet, the Paul-like missionary, were both brought under the power of the Lord, not by the preaching of man or force of argument, but by His secret manifestations to their souls during silent worship. "When," says Barclay, "I came into the silent assemblies of God's people, I felt a secret power among them which touched my heart. And as I gave way unto it I found the evil weakening in me and the good raised up. And so I became thus knit and united unto them, hungering more and more after the increase of this power and life...This is that cement whereby we are joined, as to the Lord, so to one another. Yet it is not in silence, *as silence*, that our worship consisteth, but in *a holy dependence of our mind upon God*, from which dependence silence necessarily follows in the first place until words can be brought forth which are from God's Spirit. And God is not wanting to move in His children to bring forth words of exhortation or prayer when it is needful, so that of our many gatherings and meetings, there is scarce any in which God raised not up some or other to

minister to his brethen. For when many are met together in this one Life and Name, it doth most naturally and frequently excite them to pray and to praise God, and stir up one another by mutual exhortation and instructions."

Much is it to be desired that meetings such as these might increase amongst us. There are some whose sole idea of public worship consists in going to church, chapel or meeting, whose only spiritual exercise, to use Henry Drummond's expressive words, is that of "imbibition." It is to be feared that, even with the Society of Friends, who have been largely preserved from becoming, as he says, "parasites of the pew," there has been too much of a passive assumption that the congregation consisted of a few fixed preachers and a company of equally fixed hearers. To many of these hearers the thought may have never occurred of any possibility of anything else as regards themselves. They have, as a matter of course, taken their place amongst the listeners without being fully awake to the important fact that, in united worship, an exercise ought to be maintained on behalf of others. This exercise, even though secret, would be powerful in its effect, yet if earnest heart-aspirations, and fervent soul-yearning for the deepest welfare of those who met with us abounded, would they not, more often than is the case, find an outcome in a few words of prayer or praise, or, at times, of loving exhortation, from some of those amongst us who might not be specifi-

cally called to the work of the ministry? We have need especially to be on our guard lest we deceive ourselves with the idea that silence is necessarily worship, or lest we allow our religion to be merely a selfish desire of getting good to own own souls. "The hand of the diligent maketh rich," in spiritual things as in temporal. A listless state of mind tends to spread coldness over the body at large, whilst one who is fervently engaged in seeking to draw down blessings from above contributes to the life of the congregation. So in nature; the bee gathers not honey for herself alone, but for the community of which she forms a part.

We may suitably wind up these thoughts on Worship by the following lines from the pen of a living writer :—

"There am I in the midst."

" If, as we met in the accustomed place,
 No wonder written upon any face,
He should come in and in our midst sit down,
 The Son of Man, without or cross or crown,
 But with His human hands that did enfold
 The little children tenderly of old—
 With human lips that spake in earthly speech! —
 How should we listen for what they might teach?
 Should we not wait upon the Lord that day,
 And feel to hear was only to obey?
 And when our lingering steps He bade depart,
 Would not one impulse thrill through every heart?

Would not each trembling voice one thought express
 "We will not let Thee go, except Thou bless?"
 And then—His hands uplifted as of yore—
 In "earthly fashion," He would bless once more
 And vanish from our sight. And on each face
 Astonishment should sit a little space,
 Till some gave utterance to the bitter cry,
 "Why did we not behold more steadfastly,
 Listen more closely when the Lord was nigh?"
 While some who'd known Him long, whose faces told
 That they had been with Jesus, would grow bold
 To tell whereof they knew—and this their strain—
 "Let us be patient—He will come again;
 Has He not been with us at dawn of day,
 As friend with friend, walked with us by the way,
 And dearer still, drawn near as eve grew dim,
 That He might sup with us and we with Him?"

And all should go. To such as thou and I
 A light like noontide blaze henceforth to lie
 On all things earthly; memories to be
 An unseen Presence with us constantly.
 Even as the Bride, whom the strong seas divide
 For a brief season from the Bridegroom's side,
 Yet Him in spirit near for ever feels,
 And in each word and deed to Him appeals,
 Keeping her bridal raiment clean and white,
 Than royal robes more precious in her sight,
 From rosy daybreak until twilight dim,
 Holding all service joy if done for Him,
 Waiting to join Him in a happier home,
 But glad and patient till He bids her come,
 Not seeking for herself or that or this,
 Her very life both lost and found in His.

Yet, when we meet in the accustomed place,
He fails not to be there in matchless grace ;
If we brought “ empty hands ” outstretched to Him
With pleading glance, He would His pledge redeem,
And fill them to o’erflowing ; but we stand
With downcast eye, clasping in either hand
Earth’s burdens and its treasures—hence in vain
Bends over us that face of love and pain
We left no eye to see. The feast is spread
And He, Who is Himself the living Bread
Would break to all, and with a touch divine,
Turn earthly water into heavenly wine.
All things are ready, saved the laggard guest,
So tenderly, but vainly called and pressed.
All things are ready—at the altar’s side,
With deathless love the Bridegroom waits the Bride.

CHAPTER II.

GOSPEL MINISTRY.

Collateral testimonies from W. Arthur, A. M., Finney, Bishop Pearce, Bishop of Wells, &c.

“Our sufficiency is of God, Who hath made us able ministers of the New Testament ; not of the letter, but of the Spirit, for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth Life.”

—2 Cor. iii. 6.

1. We turn next to the consideration of Spiritual Gifts. We believe that the bestowal of these is as much the prerogative of Christ now as in the days when it was said, “He gave some to be Apostles, and some Evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ.” (Eph. iv. 11-16, Revised Version.) It is our part not to appoint, but to recognise his choice.

In that remarkable book, “The Tongue of Fire,” by William Arthur, A.M., are some striking remarks in connection with our present subject. “Whether we take,” he says, “the Prophets under the Old Dispensation, or the Lord’s messengers under the New,

we find that the distinctive characteristics of a true Minister of God lay in a call and a qualification. The qualification involved a gift, a power, and a training. He who had a call from God, a gift from God, and a power from God, and he only, was ever Prophet, Evangelist or Pastor and Teacher, in any scriptural sense. The training varied with the age, dispensation, and circumstances ; but no training ever did, or ever can, make him a Minister who has no call, no gifts, and no power sent upon his soul by the anointing of the eternal Spirit”.....“ ‘The love of Christ constraineth us,’ is the language in which the Apostle expresses that which is essential in the internal working of a call from God to spend and to be spent for the salvation of men ; and he who, thus constrained by the love of Christ, finds himself possessed of a gift to speak to edification, or exhortation, or comfort, has, in that motion and in that faculty, strong evidence that the Lord is calling him into His vineyard. What he feels is not a mere desire to enter the ministry, as a good and useful office, or to spend life in an honourable and happy vocation ; but it is a constraining movement of the love of Christ, as if issuing from His heart into the heart of His servant, and working there a strong impulse to cry out and labour for the recovery of Adam’s lost children to the favour of their God, and the rest of Heaven.....He whom God sends to any work, He qualifies for that work..... Only one’s own soul can tell what has passed between

the soul and its Saviour. No stranger intermeddleth with the question whether the Spirit has, or has not, in holy promptings, moved one to consecrate his life to the sole work of edifying and multiplying the flock of Christ The Church, nevertheless, has her responsibility ; and before she seals the credentials of any, she is bound to take note whether the Lord Himself has sealed them by the gifts of His Holy Spirit. Does his whole life testify that he has felt the repentance to which he is to call sinners, exercised the faith to which he is to encourage penitents, and experienced, in some degree, that sanctification to which he is to lead on believers ? No circumstance of time, age, nation, or ought else, can authorise any Church to dispense with the essential qualification that he who is to be a Minister of God shall first be a child of God ‘ Ye shall be endued,’ said our Lord, ‘ with power from on high ’—robed with power. This is the true robing and vestment of the Minister of God—an invisible garment of power, which sits not upon his shoulders, but upon his spirit, shading him over with a moral dignity, as if he held office from the King of Kings, and conveying to every conscience before him the instinctive perception that he comes commissioned to deal with *it* on the things that affect its purity, and its relations with Him who planted it in man.”

The essential qualification for preaching the Gospel has never, we believe, been altered from the day when

our Lord called the fishermen of Galilee to leave their nets, with the simple command, "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men." The necessity of merely human study and learning is never indicated in the New Testament, although in the Epistles of Paul to Timothy he repeatedly exhorts him to diligence in the right use and cultivation of the gift, with the stewardship of which he was entrusted. "Stir up the gift of God *that is in thee.*" "Study to show thyself a workman approved unto God." "Exercise thyself unto Godliness." "Be diligent in these things, give thyself wholly to them, that thy progress may be manifest unto all." "Take heed to thyself and to thy teaching. Continue in these things. Till I come give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching." The parable of the talents teaches us that, although every ability in work for God comes solely from Himself, yet that we shall be held accountable for the increase dependent upon exercise. We cannot create the ear of corn which we sow, or command the rain or fruitful seasons, yet if we did not sow there would be no harvest. Negligence in the cultivation of spiritual gifts, in communion with God, or in the prayerful study of the Bible, is sure to be accompanied by loss of power.

The experience of Prof. Finney, President of Oberlin College, U.S.A., who was largely honoured in the conversion of sinners, is interesting, as evincing his belief in immediate inspiration as an essential

qualification for the ministry, whilst, at the same time, he was a diligent student of the Scriptures, and, above all things, fervent in prayer. "I am prepared to say," he writes, "that I think I have studied all the more from not having written my sermons. For 12 years of my earliest ministry, I was most commonly obliged to preach without any preparation whatever except what I got in prayer. Oftentimes I went into the pulpit without knowing upon what text I should speak or a word that I should say. I depended on the occasion and the Holy Spirit to suggest the text and to open up the whole subject to my mind. And certainly in no part of my ministry have I preached with greater success and power. If I did not preach from inspiration I don't know how I did preach. It was a common experience with me, and has been through all my ministerial life, that the subject would open up to my mind in a manner that was surprising to myself. It seemed that I could see with intuitive clearness just what I ought to say. And whole platoons of thoughts, words and illustrations came to me as fast as I could utter them. I almost always get my subjects on my knees in prayer, and it has been a common experience with me, upon receiving a subject from the Holy Spirit, to have it make so strong an impression on my mind as to make me tremble. When subjects are thus given me that seem to go through me, body and soul, I find they always tell with great power upon the people. Some

of the most telling sermons I have ever preached in Oberlin I have thus received after the bell has rung for church, and I was obliged to go and pour them off from my full heart. I tell this, not boastfully, but because it is a fact, and to give the praise to God and not to any talents of my own. Let no man think that those sermons which have been called so powerful were productions of my own brain or of my own heart, unassisted by the Holy Ghost. They were not mine, but from the Holy Ghost in me. And let no man say that this is claiming a higher inspiration than is promised to ministers, or than ministers have a right to expect. For I believe that all ministers called by Christ to preach the Gospel, ought to be, and may be in such a sense inspired as to preach the Gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. What else did Christ mean when He said, ‘Go and disciple all nations, and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world!’ What else did He mean when He said, speaking of the Holy Spirit, ‘He shall take of Mine and shall show it unto you?’ ‘He shall bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.’ What did He mean when He said, ‘If a man believe in Me, out of him shall flow rivers of living water? This spake He of the Spirit, which they who believe on Him should receive.’ All ministers may be, and ought to be, so filled with the Holy Spirit that all who hear them shall be impressed with the conviction that God is in them of a truth.”

A striking anecdote is recorded of Wesley, showing how he was first led to the practice of extempore preaching. We quote it verbatim: "On the last Sunday in 1788, Wesley preached to a large congregation in London. 'Sir,' said he to an attendant, 'it is above fifty years since I first preached in this chapel. I remember it from a particular circumstance. I had come without a sermon, and going up the pulpit stairs I hesitated, and returned into the vestry under much mental confusion and agitation. A woman who stood by noticed my concern, and said, "Pray, sir, what is the matter?" I replied, "I have not brought a sermon with me?" Putting her hand on my shoulder, she said, "Is that all. Cannot you trust God for a sermon?" The question had such an effect upon me that I ascended the pulpit, preached extempore with great freedom to myself and acceptance to the people, and have never since taken a written sermon into the pulpit.'"

"The model of ministry," writes Rendal Harris, "is the Lord Jesus Christ. He began with the words, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because the Lord hath anointed Me to preach.' Have we more right to preach unbaptised of the Spirit than the Master had? Ought we not rather to remember with holy importunity before the Lord that none, in those bright days, went forth without receiving power, or being breathed upon with resurrection breath, or visited with the Holy Spirit and tongues of flame?"

Perhaps in modern times there has been no one who, in what is called divine unction in the ministry and Christ-like resemblance to his Master, has exceeded our late venerated friend, William Forster. "There was about the whole man," says Benjamin Seebohm, "that peculiar expression which habitual communion with God imparts to the human countenance. You saw—you could not but see—that he was a man dedicated, set apart for the service of God. In the following words he seems to have unconsciously described the secret of his own power over his hearers. 'We do not want a superficial ministry; we do not want a flowery or an eloquent ministry. We want a sound, a living, and a baptising ministry—that will break the hard heart and heal the wounded one; a ministry that will lead the soul to Christ, the living fountain, and leave it there.' "

It is clear that in the early Church gatherings, freedom was allowed to those who met together for worship, to exercise their gifts in an orderly manner for the good of all. (1. Cor. xiv. 24, 29-33). "The essence of the Christian Community rested on this: that no individual should be the chosen pre-eminent organ of the Holy Spirit for the guidance of the whole." The simple organization which consists in the recognition of Christ as the Head, and the members of the body as in subjection to His guidance, is eminently adapted for the formation of fresh churches in foreign lands and amongst the heathen,

where all that is needed is that the converts should meet together in the name and power of the Lord Jesus, in dependence on His own assurance, "I am with you alway." Let us take two examples :—"At a college at Sapparo, Japan, was an American professor. After residing there for some time, in addition to his other duties, he was asked by the minister of education to teach the students American ethics. He replied, the only ethics he had confidence in were the ethics of Christianity, and if he should teach ethics he must begin by teaching the Bible and the Gospel of Christ. The minister demurred, but finally authorised him to teach ethics, saying that he would not inquire how he taught the subject. The teaching of the New Testament resulted in the conversion of a number of students who had embraced the Christian faith when the professor was called away. Thus left to themselves they continued to meet to wait on the Lord, to read together the Gospel and to exhort one another. They brought in their mothers, sisters and friends, and a regular meeting was established, in which the exercises were shared by those present. They urged the claims of Christ on the new students, and the good work has continued ever since."

The other instance was not less remarkable as an illustration of the same truth. "During the Mexican war, the army of General Scott left behind them, in a village near the City of Mexico, a Bible in Spanish. This was laid away in the dwelling of one of the in-

habitants. Years afterwards, a certain man who lived in the same village, became discontented with the rough manners and scandalous life of the parish priest, and sought to know if there was no other way of comfort and approach to God. The man, in whose house the Bible was, said : ‘I have a book that may tell you something, but I know nothing about it.’ The Bible was covered with dust and was brought out. The villager began to read it to himself, and then to his friends. ‘Why,’ he said, ‘this book says the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all sin, and there is no need to go to the priest.’ As he continued these meetings for reading and prayer, a little company of believers was formed, and others gathered around him. When they met, the man who first found his Bible and his Saviour said, ‘I was ignorant, I did not know what to say ; but I lifted my heart to God, and He gave me words to say.’ This meeting was continued under great opposition and persecution, but finally resulted in the formation of a Christian assembly, and in the building of a simple place of worship.”

2. As the power of the Holy Spirit is needed to guide in the exercise of the ministry, so is it also needed to restrain and constrain in the choice of the place where it is to be used. Nowhere does this feature come out more prominently than in the Acts of the Apostles, which has been called the Epistle of the Holy Ghost. We read in the 13th chapter, that

as the early church “ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, ‘Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them.’.....So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, when down to Seleucia.” On another occasion we read (Acts xvi. 6) that they were “forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia.” And again, that they “ essayed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit suffered them not.” On the other hand, when the man from Macedonia, beseeching help, appeared to Paul in a night vision, the historian adds, “Straightway we sought to go forth into Macedonia, concluding that *God had called us* for to preach the Gospel unto them.” The same guidance we look for now, and believe that as we humbly wait for it, God will and does graciously give it us.

As an illustration of this may be mentioned the experience of Stephen Grellet, during one of his missionary journeys, when intending to go by sea from Leghorn to Rome. He says, “As I was going to engage my passage for that port, my mind was introduced into unutterable distress—gross darkness seemed to be before me, whilst a bright stream of light was behind; I stood still for awhile, and found I could not go forward. I returned to my lodgings, and in my chamber poured forth my soul unto the Lord, entreating Him to direct me aright.....He gave me to see and strongly to feel that to Rome I should go, but that the time for it had not yet come, and the

language of the Spirit was, to proceed with all speed for Geneva and Switzerland. My soul was greatly humbled and tendered before the Lord, who thus condescended to instruct His poor servant, and to direct him in the way He would have him go. I remembered with awful reverence and gratitude the promise made me before I left America. 'I will teach thee and instruct thee in the way in which thou goest. I will guide thee with Mine eye.' "

The result showed the reality of the guidance, for religious engagements of great importance opened for him at and around Geneva. The clergy there at that time, as Grellet's biographer tells us, "were, with scarcely an exception, Socinian, and there is ground to believe that his labours among them were permanently blessed."

3. Although we consider the qualification for the work of the ministry to be from God, independently of human scholarship (the first preachers of the Gospel, chosen by Christ Himself, being unlearned and ignorant men), yet, in the selection of one like Paul of Tarsus, brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, to be the apostle of the Gentiles, who gloried in their wisdom, we notice the manifoldness of adaptation made use of in the spread of the Redeemer's kingdom.

So, in later times, whilst the scholastic training of Luther prepared him to write his theses, and plead his cause in Latin before the great and learned of that day, and the keen logic of a Barclay produced that master-

piece of theology, the Apology, yet the marvellous success of Moody, with his meagre education, and in their varying degrees, of others still less favoured in this respect, precludes us from placing barriers which the Lord has not placed, or from excluding any to whom He hath evidently said, "Go preach the Gospel." We acknowledge that it still often pleases Him to choose "the weak things of the world to confound the wise.....that no flesh shall glory in His presence."

4. In conformity with these general views is the belief of the Society, hinted at before, that to Women also is committed a share in proclaiming the Gospel of Christ. It was so distinctly foretold as one of the characteristics of the New Dispensation that the daughters as well as the sons should prophecy, that had it not been for the supposed prohibition of Paul, we should think that the ministry of women could hardly have failed to be recognised by the churches generally. It seems an unfair wresting of the words of the great Apostle, after his repeated mention of honourable women, his fellow-labourers, to maintain that he intended to forbid them from exercising a gift in the ministry of the Gospel of Christ. If he had meant to do this, what are we to understand by the directions concerning the attire of woman when so engaged? (1. Cor. xi. 5.) There appears to be no real difficulty in reconciling the two passages when the context is taken into consideration, and it is

interesting to find this view of the Society of Friends corroborated by that of eminent writers of other religious denominations, such as Bishop Pearce, Benson, Grotius, Adam Clark, etc. Bishop Pearce says, "When St. Paul imposes silence on women in the church, he means silence, not in opposition to any gift of the Spirit which they had, but to the desire which those who had not that Spirit might have of instructing others, or of being themselves instructed in Christian knowledge."

"The Apostolic rule," says Benson, "was that when the women were under immediate inspiration, they might pray or preach in the church. But when they were under no such inspiration they were not to speak, *i.e.*, neither to pray nor read, teach nor ask questions there." "It is clear," says Adam Clark, "that the Apostle refers to asking questions, and what we call *dictating* in the assemblies.....It was the disorderly and disobedient that the Apostle had in view, and not any of those on whom God had poured out of His Spirit." "If St. Paul," writes the Dean of Wells, "gave a special direction as to the outward dress of women who prayed and prophesied, did it not imply that they might under those circumstances prophesy—that is, speak words of comfort and counsel, as the Spirit gave them utterance?.....For my part, I find it hard to imagine that Priscilla, who expounded the way of God more perfectly even to Apollos, as Elizabeth Fry or Hannah More may have done to a

Georgian bishop—was altogether a mute person when the church in her house was gathered together that one might edify another?"

In judging of the meaning of particular precepts, it is always important to bear in mind the circumstances under which they were spoken.

Lightfoot tells us that it was customary in the Jewish synagogues for the hearers to question the ministers on such points in their doctrine as might require further explanation, and it appears probable that a similar practice had been introduced into the church at Corinth, and that the women of that church were remarkably prone to it.

The call to women to preach was not recognised first by the Society of Friends; it appears to have commenced in some of the Independent churches in England in 1641, and still earlier in America among the Baptists; during the times of declension which followed, it dropped into disuse, and was virtually forbidden in almost all the Christian sects except Friends; in the present day it is becoming again largely admitted by various denominations of Christians, though still with some restrictions as to the place in which it is exercised; and we may add, it has been eminently blessed of the Lord.

Had the Vicar of Moorwinstowe Church, in Cornwall, held the same liberal views as the Dean of Wells, he would, peradventure, notwithstanding the unprecedented nature of the occurrence, have received the

message given by Joanna Brooks on that memorable Sabbath morning to the assembled congregation in the church, as it was indeed, in truth, a message from God, and not have suffered her husband, the churchwarden, to lead her away, in the fear that she had lost her reason. A calm, unexcitable, godly woman, weighted with the sense that the Lord had commanded her to speak to the people, she folded her hands, while her voice rang out quietly and very solemnly, "Come and hear, all ye that fear God, and I will declare what He hath done for my soul." Slumbering souls were awakened by her simple, yet earnest confession of what Christ had been to her, and many who had listened from time to time unmoved, to the usual Sunday sermons, with their measured platitudes, were stirred by her living experience, and owned her as indeed "a handmaid of the Lord." Why should it be incredible to any that the Lord should send a message by the mouth of a woman, seeing that the woman of Samaria and Mary Magdalene were both his chosen messengers, and that He can work with the small as well as with the great? "Only let an instrument be perfectly pliable in His hands, and He can use it." But if any of our sisters, whom the Lord would send, are shrinking back, and are saying, "I pray Thee, have me excused," let them remember that the call to be employed by Him is one of privilege.

The woman of Samaria left her water-pot at the

well in her joy at having found "the Christ," and in her desire to spread the good news; and Mary Magdalene "did *run* to bring His disciples word" that He had risen from the dead.

He who chooses the messenger will give strength to deliver the message; but what if, by refusal, we lose the sower's joy?

CHAPTER III.

CHRIST'S REWARD.

Collateral testimonies from Geikie, Dr. Maclaren, &c.

“ Peter said unto Him, Behold, we have forsaken all and have followed Thee: what shall we have therefore? Jesus said.....Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for My Name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life.”

—Matt. xix. 27-29.

We come next to consider the ground on which the Society of Friends rests its testimony against pecuniary emolument for preaching the Gospel. Qualifications which we acknowledge to be divinely bestowed cannot stand on the same platform as an ordinary trade. “No gift of God's grace,” says Tertullian, writing in the fourth century, “is to be bought or sold with money.” We hold that what has been freely received should be freely given, and that, therefore, to quote from Benjamin Seebohm, “the ministry of the Gospel must be essentially gratuitous and free, without money and without price, without hire and without

pay." "Two things there are," says Milton, "which have ever wrought much mischief to the church of God and to the cause of truth, force on one side restraining, and hire on the other, corrupting the teachers." Even in the ancient Jewish synagogue the office of teacher was combined with a manual trade. "No Rabbi, teacher, or preacher could take money for any official duty. It was required that every Rabbi should learn a trade by which to support himself. 'He who does not teach his son a trade,' says Rabbi Jehuda, 'is much the same as if he taught him to be a thief.' One Rabbi was a needle maker, another a smith, another a shoemaker, and another, like St. Paul, who was also a Rabbi, a tent cover weaver."—*Geikie's "Life of Christ."*

Dean Stanley, alluding to the practice which obtained in the early Jewish synagogue, to which probably the meetings of the early Christians bore some resemblance, says, "No office of teaching corresponding to that of the Jewish priesthood or Christian clergy existed in the body. The instruction was given by any scholar of any pretensions who presented himself for the occasion. (See Luke iv. 16.; also Acts xiii. 15). The practice of combining the office of teachers with some manual trade was a constant safeguard against their sinking into a merely sacerdotal, or merely literary class." The Dean further alludes to the coincidence between "the indignant refusal of St. Paul, in the cities of Athens and Corinth, to

receive remuneration for his labours, and the similar protest of Socrates, by precept and example, against the injurious effect produced on teachers by direct dependence on the voluntary or involuntary payment of the hearers." Ought a standard less high than that of an enlightened heathen or that of the Jewish Rabbis to prevail in Christian churches? Ought the "loaves and fishes," the gold and silver, to be held out as an inducement for preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ, "Who, for our sakes, became poor?" Who could be more abundant in labour than the Apostle Paul? For three years, at Ephesus, teaching publicly from house to house, and warning every man, night and day, with tears, yet telling his converts, in touching words, "I coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel; yea, ye yourselves know that these hands ministered unto my necessities and to them that were with me. In all things I gave you an example, how that, so labouring, ye ought to help the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how He Himself said, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive.'" Again, in writing to the Thessalonians, he says, "Neither did we eat any man's bread for nought, but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable unto any of you, not because we have not power, but to make ourselves ensamples unto you to follow us." (2 Thess. iii. 8-9). Yet this same Apostle frankly tells us in another place, that the Lord hath ordained that they "who proclaim

the Gospel should live of the Gospel," and he adduces by way of illustration, the Mosaic law, "Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn." What is the natural inference? Is it not the same as that conveyed in the words of our Lord when He sent out His disciples two by two as His ambassadors? "And in that same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give, for the labourer is worthy of his hire," or of his "meat," as it is rendered elsewhere. Surely no idea is conveyed in either of these passages of holding out a pecuniary reward as an inducement for preaching the Gospel, while at the same time it is evident that to administer to the daily needs of those who are called to leave houses and lands for Christ's sake is a privilege to be shared by those to whom they are sent. "He that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward." "Whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in My name, because ye belong to Christ, verily, I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward."

Dr. Maclaren, the well-known minister of a very large Congregational Chapel at Manchester, alluding in one of his sermons to the words of our Lord, "The labourer is worthy of his hire," appropriately asks, "Of how much hire?" "Why," he continues, "of that amount exactly which is needful for his support while labouring, and of nothing further. Christ was bidding His disciples go forth without purse, or scrip,

or shoes, in a state of such utter poverty that they were forced to live on the hospitality of their converts, and this, the bare food and lodging offered them, is what He permits them to accept as their legitimate reward." This is the course virtually adopted now by the Society of Friends, who, when their ministers are, whether for a longer or shorter period, so closely occupied in their Lord's work that they have no opportunity to provide for themselves, freely pay the cost of their journeys and other expenses out of the common stock, whilst at the same time, the hospitality of those who are able to afford it by receiving them into their houses, is often made a blessing both to giver and receiver.

The Apostle Paul, whilst he does not urge his example as obligatory upon others, is so jealous of the reputation of the Gospel that he abstains from using an even allowable liberty, saying "What is my reward? That when I preach the Gospel, I may make the Gospel without charge, so as not to use to the full my right in the Gospel." (R. V.) In the exposition of the views of Friends, by New York Yearly Meeting, they say, "We understand Paul's example to be the true commentary by which may be understood his teachings, as to how preachers might, but had much better not, be dependent for carnal things on their fellow-men. Unquestionably the conviction, practice and testimony of Friends, for more than 200 years, have been altogether opposed to any form of any regularly salaried ministry."

Whilst we cannot but perceive on the one hand the evils attending a ministry provided for by the state, and, on the other, the scarcely less perilous course of exposing ministers to the temptation of pleasing the audience, upon whom they are dependent for voluntary support, we see that Friends stand upon vantage ground in this respect which it would be to their loss to forego.

Where it is possible to combine religious and secular employments, there are many advantages in doing so. The balance between the physical and spiritual part of our nature is better sustained; there is an added capacity to sympathize experimentally with those who have to labour for their daily bread, either by hand or brain, and no door is open for any suspicion, however unjust, that it is chosen as a way of making a living. Dr. Cyrus Hamblin, in his work "Among the Turks," writes, "Ability to engage in some secular pursuit, the conscious power to live by one's own exertions, is a necessary safeguard to the purity of the native ministry. He who enters the ministry because there is nothing else for him to do will hardly be a very spiritual-minded worker."

A Chinese Evangelist being urged to accept a salary, gave the following cogent reasons for refusing :—

"1. I have got money enough to keep my family in comfort if we are careful.

"2. When I go down to preach in the native town, I sometimes hear such remarks as these, 'How much

does he get from the foreigner? And I see they listen with respect when I tell them that I preach this doctrine because I believe it, and the foreigner does not give me a penny.

“3. I see in my Book that Paul preached, ‘working with his own hands,’ and if the pastor has no objections, I wish to do likewise.”—(*London Word and Work*).

There will, however, we must freely admit, be cases in which it is the duty of the Church to see that the right call to the ministry and all that it involves is not hindered by the lack of things needful to the body. While the aim is simple and pure, right guidance will not be denied, for the promise remains sure, “No good thing will He withhold from them that walk uprightly.”

We must not close this part of our subject without alluding to the promised reward of a true minister of Christ. “He that reapeth,” said our blessed Lord, “*receiveth wages*, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal, that both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together.”

What reward can be greater than this?



CHAPTER IV.

WHAT THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS BELIEVE RESPECTING THE ORDINANCES.

Collateral testimonies from Neander, Dr. Cumming, Dean Stanley, &c.

“Comparing spiritual things with spiritual.”

“He that is spiritual judgeth all things.”

—1. Cor. ii. 13, 15.

PART I.

There is a sentence in the Preface to the Common Prayer Book which, though we are surprised to find, it *there*, we may take as our key-note. “Christ’s gospel is not a ceremonial law (as much of Moses’ law was), but it is a religion to serve God, not in bondage of figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit.”

Perhaps no part of the principles held by the Society of Friends has been so strongly contested by other professing Christians as that which relates to the non-observance of the so-called ordinances of Baptism and the Supper. Those who plead for the precise fulfilment of the letter under all circumstances, or for the rigid imitation of the practice of the early

disciples, must in all consistency plead for the permanent retention of both these rites ; but this also on the same ground involves the retention of circumcision—for Paul circumcised Timothy, the abstaining from things strangled, the shaving of the head in making a vow, the anointing the sick with oil, and especially the washing of one another's feet as a ceremonial observance. We, on the other hand quote the saying of our Lord Himself, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." Reverencing as deeply the *spirit* of His teaching as those who differ from us do the literal interpretation, we believe that it is intended that we should separate the essential from the non-essential, the spiritual truth from its varying external clothing ; the accidental, temporary and local, from the permanent and unchangeable, retaining all that is vital, but leaving room for the growth and expansion of the life within, by allowing when it has accomplished its purpose, the temporary integument or exterior shell to drop off ; useful, it may have been, for the time that is past, but actually prejudicial when considered as its ultimatum. The old Jewish ceremonies practised long before the advent of Christ, of baptising proselytes with water, and of breaking the bread and handing round the cup at the Passover feast, were continued, with some variation of circumstance, under the New Dispensation, and not till the Jewish polity was thoroughly broken up at the siege of Jerusalem could it be

said that the latter had entirely given place to the former. We must remember that the early disciples were slow in distinguishing between literal and transitory observances and the underlying and permanent spiritual truth. The question is not, Were these observances still practised by them, but were they rendered of lasting obligation by the command of our Lord? With regard to baptism, which we will first consider, we believe we are right in distinctly answering, No. John the Baptist, who was expressly sent to baptise with water wound up the Old Dispensation and heralded the New. His baptism was the transition rite, preparing *the Jews* for the Kingdom of Christ, which he announced as at hand. No words could be plainer than those in which he contrasts his water-baptism with the Holy Ghost baptism of the Messiah. (Luke iii. 15, 16. John i. 25-33.) "He foresees how his shadowy rite must eventually pass away before the reality." "He must increase, but I must decrease." (John iii. 30.) "Our Lord submitted to the baptism of John, just as He submitted to circumcision and the Mosaic ritual, in order that in Him it might be fulfilled and emitted in a new form." At the time of His ascension He reminded His disciples of the coming baptism, in the words, "John truly baptised with water, but ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." (Acts i. 5). "The commission of Matt. xxviii. 19., was given in anticipation of the Spirit-

baptism of which the disciples were so soon to be made partakers at Pentecost; that baptism without which they could neither evangelize, nor themselves baptise others." Peter, it is true, when sent to Cornelius, commanded him and his house to be baptised with water, but we must remember the Holy Ghost had been first given, and the elemental rite appears to have been superfluous. Peter was himself taken by surprise, and almost apologizes to his brethren for receiving the Gentiles into the Christian church. "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how He said, John indeed baptised with water, but ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost," etc. "If, then, God gave unto them the like gift as He did unto us when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I that I could withstand God?" (Acts xi. 17). Very gradually the perception of the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus displaced that of adhesion to the letter, but that the necessity for water baptism had given place to that which was spiritual in the minds of Peter and Paul seems evident from the fact that Peter took pains to explain in later life that the baptism which *saves* was "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ;" and that Paul, reviewing his past labours, thanked God that he had baptised only a few converts, lest any should say that he had baptised in his own name, adding expressly, "Christ sent me not to

baptise, but to preach the Gospel." To those who have savingly experienced the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and are yet desirous of receiving baptism by water at the hands of man, might not the startling query of the Apostle to the Gentiles be fitly quoted, "Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now perfected in the flesh?" (Gal. iii. 3). Substituting the word baptism for that of circumcision, might we not apply the further words, "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love," or as it stands in another passage in the same epistle, "a new creature?" (Gal. v. 6. and vi. 15). This "new creature" is the sure and certain result of Christ's baptism, and of His alone—without it no outward symbol can avail anything—with it, having received the reality, of what avails the symbol? *The less is superseded by the greater.*

Let us hear the opinions of some men of eminence outside our society on this subject.

Justin Martyr, who lived in the second century, observed, "The only baptism that can heal us is repentance and the knowledge of God. What need is there of that baptism which can only cleanse the flesh and the body? Be washed in your flesh from wrath and covetousness, from envy and hatred, and behold the body is pure." But as spiritual fervour declined, a strong tendency to ritualism took its place. As early as the third century baptism was considered

necessary for salvation, and was performed after a rite of exorcism, by which evil spirits were said to be expelled. The baptism of bells was continued for several hundred years. Another feature of the literalizing spirit was manifested in the baptism by fire which was practised by the Jacobites in Asia, who subjected their poor little children to baptism with a hot iron on their face, ears, or arm. In the place of such extravagant errors, it is refreshing to find that a sect existing in Western Asia, from 600 to 900 A.D., called the Paulicans, maintained that it was by no means Christ's intention to institute baptism by water as a perpetual ordinance, but "by baptism He meant only the baptism of the Spirit, for by His teachings He communicated Himself as the holy water for the thorough cleansing of the entire human nature."

We are told by Neander that all dissenters from the Romish church from 500 to 1100 rejected water baptism. Walter Brute, an eminent English reformer, living at Hereford, in the fifteenth century, denied that anything more was required than repentance and faith in Christ. "Faith," says he, "is a spiritual water, springing from Him, the fountain of wisdom, wherein the soul of the sinner is washed from sin. With this water were the faithful patriarchs baptised before the law. Are not all Christians baptised with the Holy Ghost and with fire? but not with material fire. Thus, no more is the lotion of water corporeally necessary to wash away sins, but only spiritual water; that

is to say, the water of faith." "To bring man directly to Christ just as he is," remarks Dr. Cumming, "is the grand characteristic of true religion. To keep man from God, and detain him with the priest, the sacraments, the ceremony—is the grand effort of all false religions. There is no regenerative virtue inherent in, or inseparable from baptism ; for baptism is not the Holy Spirit. There is no saving and expiatory virtue in the Lord's Supper, for the Lord's Supper is not the Lord Jesus Christ. We may not put baptism in the room of the Holy Spirit, nor the Eucharist in the place of the Lord Jesus. We must look far above and beyond them both !" When H. Martyn was pressing the sacraments on a Mahomedan convert he replied, "These are mere emblems, and if a man have the reality, what need is there of emblems ?"

Maimonides, a Jewish writer of the twelfth century, tells us that a Gentile who would be received into the covenant of the Jews, must be baptised as well as circumcised, whereby he became a proselyte. "Whence it evidently appears that baptism did not come in the place of circumcision, as has been often urged."

The Talmud of the second century says, "He is no proselyte unless he be circumcised and baptised. If he be not baptised he remains a Gentile." "Purifying by water," says Dr. Robinson, the Baptist historian, "is of the highest antiquity, anterior to Judaism itself. The Romans, Greeks, Hebrews, Egyptians, Etruscans,

Ethiopians, Druids and Celts practised it. Baptism preceded the mission of John, and was practised through all the Jewish ages."

"Baptism," says Dr. Dale, "is a myriad-sided word, and means that which is capable of producing a change of condition. Classically, it is used in twenty senses. John the Baptist preached repentance-baptism, his purifying with water was simply a continuation of the office of the Levite or Jewish priest." No one could express in stronger terms than he did himself, that his mission was merely of a temporary character, and was to pass away when the greater than he should take his place.

The word Baptism is often figuratively used in Scripture. "I have a baptism to be baptised with," said our blessed Lord, in allusion to His expiatory work for the sins of mankind. And again, He said to the sons of Zebedee, "Are ye able to be baptised with the baptism wherewith I am baptised?" In the epistles of Paul this figurative use of the word is of frequent occurrence. "Buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of God." (R. V.)

"The baptism of Christ," says W. Dell, a clergyman, and master of Caius College, Cambridge, who lived in the early part of the seventeenth century, "is spirit or fire-baptism, and this is the one and only baptism of the New Testament. Its outward instrument is not material water, but the Word, as Christ

shows where He says, 'Teach, baptising,' showing that teaching the Word is the outward means of baptising with the Spirit, which is sufficient for all the faithful. He that is truly washed from all filthiness of the flesh and the spirit, what need hath he of material water to be poured on his body under the pretence of any sign whatever, when he hath the truth, substance, and heavenly thing itself?"

Let us hear "the conclusion of the whole matter" succinctly given by a writer of our own day. "He who is truly joined by a living faith to Jesus Christ is a member of His Church, even though unowned by any earthly organization.....For union with that Church there needs no baptism or confirmation, or cognizance of priest or minister. The only thing that makes a man a schismatic is that fatal unbelief, which, by cutting him off from Christ, cuts him off from that Spiritual Church which is the body of Christ."

PART 2.

In considering the subject of what is called the Lord's Supper, the same general remarks will apply. It does not appear to comport with the tenor of our Lord's teaching to substitute one rite for another, but rather so to spiritualize all our ordinary customs—even eating and drinking—to His glory, that in whatever we do, we may have him in hallowed remembrance. Especially when he was about to

leave His sorrowing disciples, fulfilling even to the last the Mosaic law, by partaking with them of the Passover feast, it would seem to be by a most natural transference of idea that He tenderly asked them to recall *Him* to remembrance when they should henceforth observe it, for He was about to fulfil by his death that solemn type, and thus to become "Our Passover, sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v. 7): We, Protestants of the present day, revolt from the idea that His words, "Take, eat, this is My body," were intended to be taken in an outward sense, and yet we know how dogmatically Luther persisted in the doctrine of Consubstantiation, as the Roman Catholics still do in that of Transubstantiation, by adhering to the literal interpretation of this passage, and can we consistently dissent from their conclusion, if we once admit that all the sayings of Christ were intended in all ages and under all circumstances to be absolutely and *literally* obeyed? How many times must the Saviour have sighed in spirit because His followers were slow to understand the true meaning of His words. Looking at everything from an outside standpoint, they literalised His deepest expressions, and even when He spoke of eating the flesh of the Son of Man and drinking His blood, they said in their utter dullness of perception: "This is a hard saying; . . . How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" And then follows the sad result of their misapprehension, "They went away and walked no more with Him."

Thus again, when, under the figure of leaven, He had wished to caution them against the doctrine of the Scribes and Pharisees, the immediate comment amongst His disciples was, "It is because we have no bread!" Whilst we marvel at such obtuseness of comprehension on their part, should it not be a lesson to us lest we too mistake the real intent of our Lord, and lessen, to our own deep loss, the force of His injunctions by taking a carnal instead of a spiritual view of His teaching? We need, as the disciples needed, to grow out of the letter into the spirit; and this we shall do only in proportion as we grow into Him who declared, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."

In a remarkable paper written by Dean Stanley on "The Eucharist" (*Nineteenth Century*, Aug., 1878), he says—"In theology, in religious conversation, in religious ordinances, we ought as much as possible to try and get beneath the phrases in use, and never to rest satisfied with the words, however excellent, until we have ascertained what we mean by them. Thus alone can we fathom the depth of such phrases; thus alone can we protect ourselves against the superstition of form and the idols of the market-place; thus alone can we grasp the realities of which words and forms are the shadow. The passage under consideration in St. John's Gospel (Chapter vi. 53-56), contains this principle, and also is one of the most striking examples of it. It is one of those startling expressions used by

Christ to show us that He intends to drive us from the letter to the spirit, by which He shatters the crust and shell in order to force us to the kernel.

“It is as if He said—‘It is not enough for you to see the outward face of the Son of Man, or hear His outward words, or touch His outward vesture. That is not Himself. It is not enough that you walk by His side, or hear others talk of Him; or use terms of affection or endearment towards Him. You must go deeper than this; you must go to His very utmost heart; to the core and marrow of His being. You must not only read and understand, but you must mark, learn, and inwardly digest and make part of yourselves that which alone can be part of the human spirit and conscience’..... It expresses what St. Paul says, ‘Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ;’ that is, clothe yourself with His Spirit as with a garment.It is the general truth which our Lord Himself expressed, ‘I am the Vine, ye are the branches.’..... It is the figure, not altogether strange to Western ears, but more familiar to the Eastern mind, in which intellectual and moral instruction is represented under the image of eating and drinking, digesting and nourishing..... It is possible that the metaphors of the Bible on this subject shall be felt to have been so misused and distorted that they also shall pass into the same abeyance as has already overtaken some expressions which formerly were no less dear to pious hearts than these..... But whatever betide, it is alike

the duty and the hope, whether of those who fondly cling to these forms or words, or of those who think... that they can dispense with them, to keep steadily in view the moral realities, for the sake of which alone, (if Christianity be the universal religion), such forms exist, and which will survive the disappearance, even of the most venerable ordinances, even of the most sacred phrases." Nevertheless, whilst claiming, in accordance with the general tenor of the New Dispensation, that the celebration of the Passover was not intended to be converted into any other permanent external rite, it is most important that we do not allow to sink into abeyance the deep teaching of our Lord Himself, that for the maintenance of our spiritual life it is essential to feed spiritually upon Him whose body was broken and whose blood was shed for us.

Even those who contend most strenuously for the necessity of the continued observance of the "Lord's Supper" have allowed such wide divergence from the primitive practice, that it is hard to see how they can assume that they are perpetuating the same thing. A ceremonial administered by a priest at the end of morning worship, is not an *evening* meal shared together in common.

Dean Stanley in his "Christian Institutions," takes pains to show that the present mode of observing the Rites, both of Baptism and the Supper, differs exceedingly from that of early times. If so, what *Command* can be pleaded for the present manner of observance?

“Infant Communion,” he says, “once universal throughout the whole church, and still retained in the East, has been forbidden throughout the whole Western Church, Catholic and Protestant alike.

“Daily communion, universal in the primitive church, has for the vast majority of Christians, been discontinued both in East and West.

“Evening Communion, the original time of the ordinance, has been forbidden by the Roman Church.

“Solitary Communion has been forbidden by the English Church.

“Death-bed Communion has been forbidden by the Scottish Church.

“It is difficult to imagine changes, short of total abolition, more sweeping than these. But yet they were induced by the higher instincts of Christendom, which grieved to see its most sacred ceremony degraded into a charm.”

A short extract from the same writer with regard to the changes which have taken place in administering the rite of Baptism may find place here, as tending to show that the plea of the literal observance of a command is not sustained by similarity of practice; and if this can be proved, what is left but the essential reality of the thing typified? “In the patristic age there was (usually) but one baptistry in each city, and that apart from the church. There was but one time of the year in which it was administered, viz., between Easter and Pentecost. There was but one person

who could administer it, the Bishop. There was but one hour for the ceremony, it was midnight.

“The torches flared through the dark hall as the troops of converts flocked in. They stretched forth their hands through the dimly-lit chamber, as in a defiant attitude towards the Evil Spirit of Darkness, and speaking to him by name said, ‘I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy works, and all thy pomps, and all thy service.’ Before and after the immersion their bare limbs were rubbed with oil from head to foot ; they were then clothed in white gowns and received the kiss of peace and a taste of honey and milk as a token of the kindly feeling of their new brotherhood, and they expressed their new faith by using for the first time, the Lord’s Prayer. These are the outer forms,” continues the Dean, “ of which, in the Western churches, almost every particular is altered, even in the most material points.”

Not less striking is the change of feeling and thought which, in the centuries succeeding the Apostolic Age, crept in respecting what was known as the Lord’s Supper. Superstitious ideas, almost approaching to an act of worship, were entertained regarding it.

Chrysostom calls it “ a most awful sacrifice, at which the very angels shuddered.” The viaticum, or holy wafer, was considered, as its name implies, to be a passport to heaven when put in the mouths of the dying ; it was kept in the houses of the people and

attached to their bodies like a talisman to defend them from evil.

One eminent evangelist of another society of professing Christians, assured the writer that amongst Lutherans in some parts of the continent of Europe, the rite was intervening between Christ and the soul as an object of dependence. Is it not to be feared, that more or less, this is becoming the case in England also ?

In *The Spectator* for August, 1872, is the following reply to Dr. Newman's "Christianity as a System" :

"The words in which the Eucharist is spoken of by St. Luke and St. Paul in no respect introduce that meaning which the church has put upon them. What can be stronger against the sanctity of particular places, nay, of any institution, rites or persons at all, than our Lord's declaration that God is a Spirit and they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth?.....The tone of the New Testament is unsacramental, and the impression it leaves on the mind is not that of a priesthood and its attendant system."

We would remind those who plead our Lord's words as a conclusive evidence that He intended to establish a ceremonial of permanent obligation, that the argument in favour of washing one another's feet as a Christian rite, rests on as strong a ground as any that can be adduced for the observance of the Supper. "I have given you an example," says Christ, "that ye should do as I have done to you." Accepting this as a literal command, the Roman Catholic church, in

the person of the Pope, has, though with strange variations, continued to perform the act, as did also the early Calvinistic Baptists and the Flemish Mennonites; how it is (except by that spirit of accommodation and extension of meaning, for which we have pleaded, translating the letter of the act into the spirit), that the Protestant bodies have agreed to reject the one and retain the other? The words of the apostle to the Corinthian church, on which so much stress is laid at the present day, do not so much appear to express a command, as to administer a rebuke to those who, while professing to hold a sacred feast, had abused it with shameful practices; and the very fact of its early degeneracy, combined with the strife which has since arisen as to the right method of its observance, and the fearful dependence which many, even in the hour of death, are placing upon it, would seem to convince us that it is far more in accordance with the will of our Lord that we should elevate our ordinary and social meals by a constant remembrance of Himself, than that at stated times, we should practice a religious rite, administered by a priest appointed for the purpose!

Let us consider a little more particularly the steps which led to its altered character. The Passover, as we know, was held only once a year, and so slowly did the New Dispensation take the place of the Old, that the Jewish Christians observed it till the destruction of Jerusalem.

The daily meal, shared together when the disciples had all things in common, became, in the Jewish and Gentile churches, known under the name of Love-feast or Agape, and was "partly social and partly religious," partly also partaking of a benevolent character, as the term Eucharist implies, "a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

"In those early times," remarks Dean Stanley, "it was the common festive gathering of rich and poor in the same social meal, to which, as St. Paul enjoined, every one was to bring his portion. And further, with this practice, of which almost all traces have disappeared from all modern modes of administering the Lord's Supper, there was united, from the earliest times, the practice of collecting alms and contributions for the poor at the time when our Christian communion and fellowship with each other is most impressed upon us.....Gradually the repast was separated from the religious act. The repast became more and more secular, the religious act more and more sacred. From century to century the breach widened. The ministers alone, instead of the congregation, took the task of distributing the elements. The daily administration ceased and was confined to Sundays and festivals. Finally, the meal itself fell under suspicion. Augustine and Ambrose condemned it, and in the fifth century that which had been the original form of the Eucharist was forbidden as profane by the councils of Carthage and Laodicia."

“It is somewhat remarkable,” we quote from the “Early Church History,” by Backhouse and Tylor, “that neither Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Polycarp, nor others of the early Apologists, make any allusion to the Lord’s Supper. Ignatius says nothing respecting the outward observance, but pours out his soul for the spiritual communion. ‘I seek the bread of God,’ he says, ‘which is Jesus Christ, and I seek His blood, which is love incorruptible!’”

The view of the non-perpetuity of any outward “sacrament,” as it is called, was not altogether peculiar to Friends, nor did it originate with them, although they arrived at it from independent conviction. There were some, in the early days of Christianity, who rejected both the ordinances, and in the eleventh century, Robert, King of France, caused thirteen noblemen to be burnt at the stake simply for denying their necessity. More than a century before the time of George Fox, Schwenkfeld, a Silesian nobleman, personally acquainted with Luther, “having studied the Holy Scriptures day and night, expresses his belief that the participation in the Lord’s Supper should be tied to no such outward eating and drinking, and he neither partook of it himself nor recommended it to his followers, though he left them at liberty. His words are: ‘The eternal High Priest, Jesus Christ, invites the believing table-guests unto holiness, and it is bound to no outward thing.....As often as a man receives divine sweetness in Christ, so often

he keeps the Lord's Supper with Christ. We shall also strive that we may keep it daily with Him.' "

Strikingly in accordance with this view are the words of Barclay, "The Communion of the body and blood of Christ is inward and spiritual, which is the participation of His flesh and blood, by which the *inward man* is daily nourished in the hearts of those in whom Christ dwells. Of which things the breaking of bread by Christ with His disciples was a figure, which even they who had received the substance used in the church for a time, even as abstaining from things strangled, &c., yet seeing they are but *shadows* of better things, they cease in such as have obtained the substance."

Yet whilst accepting the noble maxim, that "the spirit and not the letter of the law is the essence of every great and good utterance," it is of paramount importance that our religion should not consist in negations. The disuse of the form must be the result of possessing the reality or it will avail us nothing. We must come to Christ that we may realize for ourselves His own soul-purifying baptism, even "the baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire." We must open our hearts that the Lord Jesus may come in and sup with us and we with Him. Then shall we know for ourselves the deep significance of His own saying, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are *life*."

CHAPTER V.

WAR.

Collateral testimonies from Tertullian, Lamartine, Gibbon, &c.

“Put up again thy sword into his place.”

—Matt. xxvi. 52.

We come next to consider the subject of war. The Society of Friends has ever taken its stand on the general tenor of the teaching of Christ, and His expressed words, “Love your enemies.” On this ground alone is its position impregnable.

The refusal of many of the early Christians to bear arms was based on a precisely similar principle, *“I am a Christian, and therefore I cannot fight.”* Cassion, the notary, and Maximilian, were both martyred because they could neither enlist nor remain in the army after they had embraced Christianity. Tertullian says, “Can a soldier’s life be lawful when Christ has pronounced that he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword? Can one who professes the peaceable doctrines of the Gospel be a soldier, when it is his duty not so much as to go to law?” Lactantius declares, “It can never be lawful for a righteous man to go to war, as war is unrighteous in

itself." Gibbon says, "The humble Christians were sent into the world as sheep among wolves, and since they were not permitted to employ force, even in the defence of their religion, they deemed that they should be still more criminal if they were tempted to shed the blood of their fellow-creatures in disputing the vain privileges or the sordid possessions of this transitory life." Lamartine says, "War, very far from being the progress of humanity, is only *Murder in Mass*, which retards it, afflicts, decimates it, dishonours it. The nations who sport in blood are instruments of ruin, not instruments of life to the world. They may grow, but they grow contrary to the purposes of God, and end by losing in one day of justice that which they have conquered through years of violence."

Prize-fighting has been rightly declared to be barbarous. Duelling could no longer remain legalized in the face of the advancing civilisation of our country; when will Christianity so assert her sway over all Christendom as to forbid the resort to the demon of War?

When shall the reproach be rolled away that the heathen have more faith in their false gods than Christians in their great Lawgiver?

John Ruskin says, "The Christian religion which we have been taught for two thousand years is still so little conceived by us that we suppose the laws of charity and self-sacrifice bear upon individuals in all their social relations, and yet do

not bear upon nations in any of their political relations.”—*Stones of Venice*.

As we have been drawing on outside evidence in confirmation of our own principles on this subject, we will give a quotation from the pen of a gentleman of high position who associated from childhood with the first military circles, many of his nearest connections having distinguished themselves in the Army or Navy. His own conclusions have been, therefore, attained in the face of all educational prejudices, and purely by the force of irresistible Christian conviction. He says:—“Having consulted the highest *authority* how I shall best succeed in overcoming evil, and having examined what all experience and all well-considered theory can teach on the subject, I find that force of arms has ever been uncertain in its power to save, even for a time; I find that courageous coolness, united with fearless goodwill even towards enemies, has, both in theory and practice, far more power to subdue than force of arms; and I find that God’s own teaching is explicit on the subject. Therefore I am sure that the best way to *secure* the safety of country or family is by open declared love to man, and obedience to God.....This is my *principle*; if professing followers of the Lord of Hosts, the Captain of Salvation, have the wisdom and courage to follow His counsel in preparation, and to obey His command in action, they will show the world what it is to *overcome evil with good*.”

“Can nothing be done,” said the late Samuel Morley, M.P., “to lead to the establishment of some international tribunal to which might be referred misunderstandings between one country and another, which, although serious in their results, are generally trifling in their origin?.....Our commerce, our civilisation, and above all, our Christianity, alike protest against the enormous wickedness and inhumanity of war.”

Canon Fremantle recently declared in Canterbury Cathedral that “we must love Christian justice and goodness more than imperial power. We must submit, if need be, to the loss of prestige, that we may do right or repair wrong. We must risk much, rather than bring about war; we must risk all rather than do wrong.”

Bishop Fraser says, “War is not the triumph of righteousness. It is the triumph of brute force. Can anything be conceived more un-Christian, more irrational, than the present mode in which international quarrels are commonly adjusted? I am aware that certain plausible arguments are forthcoming in favour of War.....But I respectfully submit that there are other ways of restoring the purity of the nation and of maintaining national honour, other ways of showing the spirit of patriotism, than by resorting to the savage and irrational conclusions of War.”

If any, looking simply from the stand-point of a worldly policy, should say, “The Peace principles

will never *work*;" we would reply that in the face of very unpromising circumstances, they were fairly tried under the wise government of William Penn, and the "Holy Experiment" as it has been called, was found completely to answer. "This was the treaty of which it has been said that it was the only one ever made with the Indians that was not ratified by an oath, and the only one that was never broken..... And this triumphant result followed a policy of simple justice and of obedience to the command of the Divine Master, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.*'"

The reign of Him who Himself declared, "My kingdom is not of this world, if My kingdom were of this world then would My servants fight,"—that reign which was ushered in by the angelic song, "Peace on earth, goodwill to men," appears so self-evidently opposed to the awful carnage of the battle field, that it only affords another humiliating proof of the perversion of the human understanding by the fall, that casuistic argument or subtle sophistry can avail with any who bear the name of Christian to reconcile such departure from the spirit of the Christian code. He who was emphatically called the "Prince of Peace," who commanded His disciples to love their enemies, who said to the impetuous Peter, "Put up thy sword into its sheath," leads His hosts to battle in another warfare,

* From "Glimpses of George Fox and his Friends," by Jane Budge.

the weapons of which are not carnal but spiritual, directed not against flesh and blood, but against "spiritual wickedness in high places." Holding this faith, we continue to bear an unflinching testimony against all war, while we wait in earnest expectation for the approach of that day, the consummation of all that we long for, when "the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow into it"—when the people "shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks," when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

CHAPTER VI.

OATHS.

Collateral testimonies; Linacre, Carey, &c.

“Above all things, my brethren, swear not.....but let your yea, be yea, and your nay, nay, lest ye come into condemnation.”

—James iv. 12.

The next point to which we will devote a few words is that of Judicial Oaths, for their testimony with regard to which we know that the early Friends suffered most unjustly and severely. Yet they were by no means the first to declare that swearing, under any pretext, was a violation of the command of the Founder of our religion. For the first three centuries after Christ up to the time of Constantine, it appears that Christians had no doubt on the subject, for nothing could be plainer than our Lord's words, “Swear not at all.” But as it was in the case of war, so with swearing. When Christianity began to decline, the pure teaching of the Master was disregarded. We are told of a learned man, Dr. Linacre, who was a teacher in Oxford University, Physician to Henry VII., and tutor to the Prince of Wales, but

who, living in the darkness that prevailed three centuries ago, had never seen the New Testament till he lay on his death-bed, and as he read the precept, "Swear not at all," he exclaimed, "Either this is not true, or we are not Christians."

Carey, the first English missionary to the heathen, and the originator of English Protestant Missions, had conscientious scruples against taking an oath: he condemned severely the manner in which oaths were administered, and vehemently urged the propriety of altogether dispensing with them. On three several occasions he made known his views on this subject to those in authority, and once, at considerable personal inconvenience, had to suffer the consequences of his refusal.

The Albigenes, Moravians, and afterwards the Mennonites, shared in the same testimony. We may, indeed, rejoice that persecution on this account has at length given place to liberty of conscience, and that anyone in the British Empire who has a conscientious objection to an oath may now take the affirmation in a court of law.

CHAPTER VII.

THE GROUND OF PROTEST AGAINST CONFORMITY TO THE WORLD.

Collateral testimonies ; Cyprian, St. Augustine, Edward
Denison, &c.

*“Not fashioning yourselves according to your former
lusts in your ignorance.”*

—1 Pet. i. 14.

CONCLUSION.

“What a tremendous innovation on our work-a-day world is Christianity ! What a steady nonconformity to the world’s habits it demands of its votaries !” So wrote the young and gifted Edward Denison, M. P. for Newark, who lived a life of self-sacrifice, and early heard his Master’s “Well done, good and faithful servant !”

It was the deep conviction of the truth so powerfully expressed in the few words we have quoted above, which led the Early Friends to bear an uncompromising testimony against the adulatory flattery and trifling vanities of the corrupt age in which they lived.

It has often been erroneously supposed, at least in earlier times, that they advocated a certain garb, and aimed at peculiarity of expression, but this was simply the unavoidable result of not changing with the changing stream of fashion ; the true spirit of their testimony on these subjects being that “every visible habit and action, dress, language, behaviour, furniture, diet, pursuits, companions,” and even his choice of amusements and recreations should bear witness that the Christian’s rest is not here, but that his “citizenship is in Heaven.” It is the privilege of the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, to be as His living “epistles, known and read of all men.”

The Society of Friends, in its corporate capacity, has refused to sanction the practice of putting on *mourning for the dead*, first, because it is not always a truthful expression of feeling ; second, because it often entails on survivors cost and expense which cannot suitably be incurred, and which sometimes leads into debt ; third, because at a time when God would speak to the soul, through the solemn visitation of death, it is very undesirable to have the mind diverted by attention to outward attire ; fourth, because injury to health and to sight is frequently the result consequent upon the pressure of work at such times ; and lastly, because when we know that our dear ones are taken to eternal bliss above, some unselfish sympathy in their joy is often graciously permitted, and the sable garb of woe seems at variance with the

“voice from Heaven, Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord.”

“It was consonant with the new and glorious hope brought in through the Gospel, that the early Christians should despise and cast aside the whole paraphernalia of mourning which they saw around them:—the sackcloth and ashes and rent garments of the Jews, the black apparel of the Romans, and the mourners hired to wail in both Eastern and Western nations.

“Cyprian expresses himself in very strong terms regarding mourning and mourning apparel. Writing concerning those who died in the pestilence in the reigns of Gallus and Valerian, he says: ‘How often and how manifestly has it been revealed to me by the condescension of God that I should publicly declare that our brethren who are escaped from this world by the Lord’s summons are not to be lamented, since we know that they are not lost, but gone before. Though they are to be longed for, they are not to be bewailed; and it is not becoming to us to put on *black* garments for them *here*, when they are already clothed in *white* raiment *there*.’

“So Augustine, still later, queries, ‘Why should we disfigure ourselves with black, unless we would imitate the unbelieving nations, not only in their wailing for the dead, but also in their mourning apparel? Be assured these are foreign and unlawful usages, but if lawful, they are not becoming.’ The

coffin was borne to the grave on the shoulders of the kinsmen and near friends, who, as they went along, sang hymns of hope and praise.”—*Backhouse and Tylor’s “Early Church History.”* Even when those who had suffered martyrdom were carried by their friends to burial in the Catacombs, no outward sign of mourning was apparent. Songs of triumph marked the occasion, witnessing to the truth of the words engraved over the tomb: “Mors conscia Christi, nescia Mortis.”

And now in bringing these cursory remarks to a conclusion, we think it will be evident to those who have followed the course of this paper, that the Society of Friends have accepted in general, the *spirit* of the teaching of the New Testament rather than the exact formula of its words. They believe that herein lies the superior glory of the New Dispensation in contra-distinction to that of the Old, adapting it not alone to one favoured race, or to one period of the world’s history, but from the very power of its inherent expansiveness, fitting it for all modifications of race and age to the end of time, and thus giving incontrovertible evidence of its Divine origin. The “last days,” so long the subject of prophecy, have dawned upon us. Christ, the High Priest of good things to come, has clearly announced His Kingdom; the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, has been given to guide His people into all truth.

Under this blessed reign we are living: are we

true and loyal subjects? It is our glorious privilege to be led about, not by the pillar of fire and cloud in our wilderness journey, but by Him who has declared Himself to be "the Way, the Truth, and the Life." But in order to discern His guidance, we need the single eye and the submissive heart. We need to walk in that close communion which brings us, so to speak, "*en rapport*" with our Lord, quickening our spiritual instincts and enabling us to distinguish His voice from the voice of the stranger. It is of the utmost importance that we are not self-deceived here, for the guile of the enemy is never more successfully exerted than by specious imitations of this blessed truth, leading to grievous errors. We are told by our Lord Himself that the especial office of the Holy Spirit was to glorify Him, and we may well consider as a delusion any pretention to spiritual guidance which tends to lower Christ in His character or offices. "We shall be very willing," says Barclay, "to admit it as a positive, certain maxim, that whatsoever any do, pretending to the Spirit, which is contrary to the Scriptures be accounted a delusion of the devil." Our place of safety is at the feet of Jesus. "I thank Thee, oh Father," were His own words, "that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes."

It remains finally to consider whether the mission of the Society of Friends has fulfilled its purpose, and whether it can, without injury to the

spread of the Redeemer's kingdom, retire from the field.

We believe that the unanimous answer from the spiritually minded of other Churches would be, "We cannot spare you yet." Let us rather seek for greater faithfulness in upholding the banner given us to bear, nor desert our post till the time come, shadowed forth by the author of a paper called "The Future of Quakerism ;"

"When the other Christian Churches are willing to lay down the sword ;

"When they cease to claim any priestly power for their minsters above their lay members ;

"When judicial swearing no longer degrades the national standard of truthfulness ;

"When preaching *for the sake of money* is declared intolerable ;

"When no ordinance or ceremony is held to be necessary to salvation, but only a practical faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for our sins, and rose again for our justification ;

"When Christian worship is recognised to consist simply in spiritual communion with God, the ministers of the word being of God's appointment and God's preparing ;

"When the voice of Christ in the heart and the sensible influence of the Spirit of Truth leading into all truth are more universally spoken of as realities to be the guide of a man's life and actions ;

“When the churches make a more definite effort not to be conformed to the world.”

Then, whether the present Society continue or not is a matter of comparative indifference,—the truths it has ever held and taught are old as Christianity, and co-existent with it.

A standard 1D barcode with vertical black bars of varying widths on a white background. Above the barcode, the text "Princeton Theological Seminary" is printed in a small, sans-serif font. Below the barcode, the number "11 1000 0000 0000" is printed in a larger, bold, sans-serif font.

1 1012 01144 8588

[illegible]

Phil
—

